

propaganda and actions throughout this hemisphere and the world.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, by inclusion of the production tax credit in H.R. 2776. That PTC provides a tax credit for electricity produced from renewable energy facilities. Sources such as wind, solar and biomass are included under the tax credit.

Since its enactment in 1992, the credit has encouraged the development of thousands of megawatts of clean, renewable electric generation facilities. Florida, for example, Mr. Speaker, is home to Florida Power & Light, owner and operator of two of the largest solar projects in the world and the Nation's largest wind energy company. Because of the long-term commitment to renewable energies by this Congress, companies like FPL have made significant, needed investments to advance non-emitting forms of energy, and that is the kind of work that we must continue.

Now, the majority, Mr. Speaker, promised that it would run the House in an open and bipartisan manner. If this is an open and bipartisan process, I would hate to see a closed one. Later today I fear the majority will break precedent again and come to the floor to close the open amendment process on the Department of Defense appropriations bill as well.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a difficult week for both sides of the aisle, but moving forward with restrictive rules such as this on important issues only makes matters worse. It is most unwise, as well as unfortunate.

This rule is unnecessarily unfair and should be soundly defeated.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. I rise in support of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, this rule today lays the framework for a historic debate, a debate that will talk about the energy future of the United States of America, an agenda that has not been discussed out here on the House floor, although there has been a pent-up demand by the American people that we move to this new renewable energy agenda for the 21st century.

Climate change has now become a problem, not only for the United States, but for the whole world. We must be the leader.

In 1986, we imported 27 percent of our oil. Today, we import 61 percent of our oil. Today, we begin the effort to turn that around, to unleash the entrepreneurial spirit of our country, to unleash a technological revolution that can capture the solar, capture the wind, capture the cellulosic future for our country; make our country more efficient, have the devices which we use to consume energy infinitely more efficient. That is the debate that we have been missing here in America, and

today we begin that debate here on the House floor.

This is what the American people want. This is what the world has been waiting for, a debate on the energy future of the United States; unleashing its technological genius, and as a result, making it possible for the rest of the world to gain access to these technologies.

This is the day, and we have to be the leaders. This rule is now constructed in a way in which we can begin the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the rule.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule that is bringing this legislation to the floor today, because what we have is 768 pages of a bill, H.R. 3221, and, guess what, it doesn't do a thing about producing one drop of energy. It does not get the price down at the pump.

And that is what the American people continue to ask us, what are you going to do about high home heating bills? What are you going to do about the price at the pump? And, yes, indeed, as my esteemed colleague just said, alternatives are important. Looking to the future is important. R&D, all of that. We have to have emphasis there.

But at the same time, we have to realize production, American production and American solutions are important to this debate, and we have got 768 pages that do not put the emphasis on American production to address this.

What we do have is increased regulation. We have got a section in this bill that would put the Federal Government more into the process by which States develop and enforce their own building codes.

Regulation is not going to get us to further conservation. We know that efficiency is important. We know that conservation is important. But we also know if you overregulate and if you overtax, you are going to be killing jobs.

We know for a fact that if you get in here and you tax something more, you are going to get less of it. If you incentivize it, you are going to get more of it. The American people want to see the price down at the pump. That is not what they are going to see in this bill that is brought before us today.

Conservation and efficiency is important. It is not the total answer, and we are missing a great opportunity to incentivize American production of American fuels that will move us towards energy independence. We are not doing that with this legislation.

In the portion of this that deals with the tax, one of the things that we have seen happen here is that we have more taxes. They put cigar taxes in place.

They put health insurance taxes in place.

I tell you, this new majority, if it is moving, if it is shaking, if it is waving in the wind, they are going to tax it, because they need money to pay for the programs that they are putting on the books. And it is the American taxpayer that is paying more at the pump that is watching their gas tax go up. They are watching cigarette and cigar taxes go up. When they get their statement for their health insurance, they are going to see a tax on that, because they had to find a way to pay for all these new programs.

Mr. Speaker, they are just addicted to putting a tax on everything that is moving. We are seeing the same thing take place in this lack-of-energy bill that is brought before us today.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time until the gentleman has closed for his side and has yielded back his time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my privilege to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the distinguished ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, before I get into my comments on the substance of the rule, I want to put to rest a rumor. My good friend Mr. MARKEY is hobbling around on crutches. My good friend Chairman DINGELL is also hobbling around on crutches. It is not because of anything the Republicans have done on the Energy and Commerce Committee. We actually like each other. It is just one of those years I guess for being in the majority and the burdens of leadership, is all I can say.

We have a rule before us today on an energy bill. There is not a lot you can say positive about it except that it is a rule. It is a modified closed rule. There are some amendments made in order. There is not a substitute made in order.

Now, somewhere I have a press release from the chairwoman of the Rules Committee, the distinguished Congresswoman SLAUGHTER of New York, and I also have a press release from the distinguished Speaker, Speaker PELOSI of California, and they were talking about an open process, and when we had major bills on the floor, that it would be normal procedure for the minority to have a substitute.

So we took them at their word. DENNY HASTERT, the former Speaker, and myself and RALPH HALL, the ranking member of the Science Committee, and DON YOUNG, the ranking member of the Resources Committee, and Mr. MICA, the ranking member of the Transportation Committee, we prepared a comprehensive alternative substitute. We took it to the Rules Committee. We asked that it be made in order.